DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 767 RC 014 786

AUTHOR Barger, Ken; Reza, Ernesto
TITLE Survey of Midwestern Farmworkers (1983). Project Summary.
PUB DATE 7 Mar 84
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agricultural Laborers; Demography; *Farm Labor; *Labor Conditions; Labor Problems; Labor Standards; *Mexican Americans; Migrant Health Services; Migrant Housing; *Migrant Problems; Migrant Welfare Services; *Migrant Workers; Seasonal Laborers; Spanish Speaking; Unions; Well Being; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS Indiana; Michigan; Ohio; *United States (Midwest)

ABSTRACT

In 1983, personal interviews with 38 adult, Mexican American, migrant farmworker, male heads of households working tomato crops in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan revealed living and working conditions and views and involvement regarding labor rights and the farmworker movement among the estimated 65,000 Midwestern migrant farmworkers. Interview data were organized into 10 sets of findings: general farmwork experience, health, life well-being and stress, locus of control, social supports, experience in the Midwest, living and working conditions, views on farmworker labor rights, views about the farmworker movement, and demographic background. Most farmworkers were from Texas (63%) and Florida (34%) and were American citizens (89%). Average age was 36 years, family size - 5.6 persons, education level - 6.8 years, 1982 income - $6,447, time worked in farm labor -18.9 years, and annual employment in farmwork in the Midwest - 3.4 months. Although 42% experienced above average health problems, a doctor had not been seen in an average of 26.3 months. While farmworkers had little meaningful interaction with people outside work settings, they perceived that they generally experienced worse housing, sanitation, and education than other Midwesterners. Over 20% belonged to United Farm Workers; 99% endorsed farmworker labor rights; and 32% had actively supported the movement and participated in movement events. References are listed and survey results are presented. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Project Summary
March 7, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W.K. Barger
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SURVEY OF MIDWESTERN FARMWORKERS (1983)

Ken Barger
Department of Anthropology
Indiana University Indianapolis
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202
(317) 264-3788

Ernesto Reza
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
(313) 764-8397

JUN 1984
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

ED244767

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Background

About 65,000 farmworkers come into the central Midwest every growing season to plant and harvest tomatoes, cucumbers, beets, strawberries, cherries, apples, and other vegetable and fruit crops. Most of these people are Mexican Americans who originate from lower Texas. Some farmworkers have moved their base to Florida where they can work fruits during the winter season, and some have settled in Midwestern communities and work local crops on a seasonal basis.

Farmworkers are a hard-working people, and they make a significant contribution to the agricultural economy in the areas where they work. But these people experience among the most deprived socioeconomic conditions of any group of American workers. They are involved in strenuous and deforming stoop labor, experience child labor and chronic underemployment, have an annual income far below the poverty level, live in crowded one-room labor camp cabins, are provided poor sanitation facilities in the campes and none in the fields, experience high disease and mortality rates, and are subjected to discrimination and unscripulous labor practices. Farmworkers are specifically excluded from key labor laws, and where they are covered standards are reduced and laws are not enforced. These conditions have been documented for well over half a century, but the same basic problems persist generation after generation.

RC014786

Few alternative solutions have effectively addressed farmworkers' poor conditions. Historically, the initiative of the agricultural businesses who benefit the most from their labor, legislation, and social service programs have never effectively improved farmworker conditions. The only solution that has historically proven to be effective has been the farmworker movement, in the case of the United Farm Workers (UFW). Where UFW has labor contracts, there is no longer child labor, parents earn enough to support their families, and farmworkers enjoy health insurance and other fringe benefits assumed as the norm for most other American workers.

In the Midwest, a sister farmworker organization to the UFW has emerged, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC). FLOC is currently leading a major social movement that draws upon ethnic and labor ideology. FLOC has organized over 2,000 tomato workers in the central Midwest, and has tried to negotiate three-way contracts with large agricultural corporations and growers. After attempts to negotiate failed, FLOC farmworkers went on strike against all Campbell Soup and Libby tomato fields in the Midwest, and have called for a citizens' boycott of all Campbell's and Libby's products in support of Midwestern farmworkers. A recent public opinion survey conducted by Indiana University at Indianapolis reveals overwhelming popular endorsement of farmworker labor rights and of the farmworker movement in the Midwest. But while the position of the leaders of the farmworker movement is clear, the views of Midwestern farmworkers themselves have not been documented.

Purposes of the Survey Project

From August through October 1983, an initial scientific survey of Midwestern farmworkers was conducted, with two purposes in mind. First, almost all of the information about farmworkers has been based on the nonrepresentative records of government migrant agencies; so one purpose of the survey project was to provide representative, population-based data to more clearly identify patterns and variations among farmworkers, particularly experiences and views regarding work histories, health and general well-being, living and working in the Midwest, and other socioeconomic conditions.

A second purpose was to document population-based experiences and views regarding labor rights and the farmworker movement in the Midwest. While FLOC claims to represent Midwestern farmworkers in general, as well as its own membership, this claim has been regularly challenged. A valid scientific survey should be able to establish how much FLOC actually does represent Midwestern farmworkers in its labor organiing and collective bargaining goals.

Research Methodology

The main method of the project was a cross-sectional study of Midwestern farmworkers. The study population is defined as the estimated 15,000 farmworkers involved in the 1983 tomato harvest in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. In order to control for confounding sociocultural factors, the study population is further defined as those estimated 3,000 Mexican American migrant farmworkers who are adult male heads of household. The research design consists of stratified sampling on the basis of state (Indiana, Ohio, Michigan), labor camp, and residential cabin.

During August, September, and October of 1983, 42 personal interviews were conducted by the investigators and by Mexican American interviewers with farmworker backgrounds. The interviews averaged one and a quarter hours. Six sampled individuals declined to be interviewed, giving a response rate of 87.5%. Four of those interviewed were not included in the analysis because they did not fit the defined study population (married, Mexican Americans).

Given a significance level of 0.10. the maximum confidence interval is 0.13; that is, there is a 90% probability that the responses reported here do not vary from those of the total study population by more than 13% at the most (and by 0% at the least). Where more than 10% of the sample did not respond to or were not asked about a particular item, this is indicated. Student's t tests indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in the responses of those interviewed by different interviewers, in those working in Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, and in those based in Texas and Florida; these tests indicate that these factors have not influenced results.

Survey Results

The attached Survey Results indicate the average or percentage of responses and the frequency of several scales constructed from the responses. In general, there are ten sets of findings:

(1) General Farmwork Experience: Farm labor as an occupation presents a unique set of challenges, with both advantages and disadvantages. Married males tend to have been involved for most of their adult lives, having been raised in a farmworker family. Most feel that they are not skilled for other work, without really recognizing the special abilities that they do possess (such as planning within a mobile life style to maximize annual earnings). Many have held other jobs from time to time, but most experience over two months unemployment a year, with farm labor in the Midwest being a major part of their annual employment. The majority feel threatened by displacement from agricultural mechanization, and a substantial proportion have actually been displaced by machines. Though they recognize both good and bad sides to farmwork, most generally focus on the more positive aspects of their occupation.

(2) Health: A nationally standardized set of questions regarding health conditions (HANES) was used to assess signs and symptoms. A large proportion of farmworkers report not feeling healthy, with upper respiratory, dental, and back and neck problems being the most common complaints. When it is felt that an illness warrents medical attention, migrant or other public clinics are the most utilized for health care, but even these are not used much. One serious occupational hazard is exposure to dangerous pesticides, and farmworkers report being exposed on an average of about seven times a year. It is estimated that almost half of Midwestern farmworkers are in need of medical attention, and most others are in need of some health care.

(3) Life Well-Being and Stress: While most farmworkers report feeling generally positive about their lives, they are not necessarily very hopefull, and a majority indicate some tenseness. Responses to a standardized set of questions indicates that about a 25% are experiencing some degree of distress. This might be due in part to he fact that the interviews were

conducted during a period when people were working hard for long hours earning a significant proportion of their annual income.

(4) Locus of Control: Almost half of the farmworkers exhibit a sense of personal control in their lives; that is, they feel they can exert some influence in life events. Such a sense of control can be one psychological resource in meeting life challenges. In addition, most feel that collective action is the best way to influence such events.

(5) Social Supports: The feeling of emotional, conceptual, and practical supportiveness from others is an important psychological resource in meeting life challenges. Not unlike other people, farmworkers indicate that they feel such social supports mostly from their families and other close relations. Other kinds of relationships provide less support. Overall, most farmworkers exhibit adequate feelings of social supports.

(6) Experience in the Midwest: While working in the Midwest, farmworkers interact mostly with others in and around the labor camps in which they are located. They have little meaningful interaction with people outside their immediate work setting. Since the majority experience societal isolation while in the Midwest, it is not surprising that they have few serious complaints about the few meaningful relations that they may have.

(7) Living and Working Conditions: Farmworkers feel that they generally experience worse conditions than people living in the Midwest. When this is considered along with chronic underemployment and poverty-level income, almost all migrants who come to the Midwest experience severely deprived socioeconomic conditions.

(8) Views on Farmworker Labor Rights: There is almost universal agreement among Midwestern farmworkers that they should receive basic labor rights, most of which are already enjoyed by other American workers.

(9) Views About the Farmworker Movement: Midwestern farmworkers also exhibit general endorsement of the farm labor movement. A majority have heard of the UFW and FLOC, and there is widespread approval of such organizatons, of the rights to labor organizing and collective bargaining, of working under negotiated labor contracts, of going on strike if necessary to achieve better conditions, and of public boycotts in support of farmworkers. Many are informed about specific activities of the movement, and have even actively participated in some of the strikes and boycotts. Over one-fifth of Midwestern farmworkers claim to belong to the UFW and FLOC, and a majority of the rest indicate that they would be interested in belong to such farm labor organizations. Almost half of the Midwestern farmworkers are knowledgeable about the farm labor movement, and an overwhelming majority approve of this movement's organizations, goals, and means. About a third of the Midwestern farmwokers have actively supported the movement and have actively participated in movement events and activities at one time or another.

(10) Demographic Background: Most Midwestern farmworkers in the study group are based in Texas or Florida, average 36 years old, and have over five members in their family. Though most young children are spared field work, there are still an estimated 3,000 children working in the tomato crops in the

central Midwest. Farmworkers average less than a 7th grade education, and most are able to communicate some in English. Average family income is about $6,500 a year, well below poverty standards, and over half of this is earned while working crops in the Midwest. Farmworkers spend about half of their Midwestern earnings locally, an estimated total of about $5 million for tomato workers alone (and almost $20 million for all Midwestern farmworkers). They thus make important economic contributions to local and regional economies where they work, in addition to their key involvement in agricultural production. Almost all farmworkers are Roman Catholic, and many exhibit regular religious faithfulness. Contrary to popular misconceptions, most farmworkers are American citizens, some of whom are active voters with a preference for the Democratic party.

Conclusions

At least four major conclusions can be drawn from the survey findings:

(1) Existing information on farmworkers compiled from agency, employment, and case history records is sometimes incomplete and biased, and caution must be exercised in using non-representative information about farmworkers. The survey indicates that only 16% of the migrant farmworkers in the Midwest come in contact with service agencies, and only 3% indicate any extensive involvement with these agencies. The survey also shows that farmworkers are in the Midwest only about four months of the year. Furthermore, nowhere is it reported how much of an economic contribution farmworkers make in the Midwestern regions where they work. Not only do they make the basic contribution to economic production in the agricultural industries in which they work, but they currently collectively spend about $20 million dollars in local purchases while in the area.

(2) The popular view that farmworkers experience deprived socioeconomic conditions is shared by Midwestern farmworkers themselves. In a 1982 survey of popular views about farmworkers (Barger and Haas 1983), an overwhelming proportion of the public believes that farmworkers have poor housing, poor education, poor health, child labor, and other disadvantage conditions. Farmworkers themselves also feel that they have substandard conditions, and such factors as poverty-level income and underemployment bears this out. Thus it is safe to conclude that farmworkers are one of the most disadvantaged groups of American workers.

(3) Midwestern farmworkers almost universally endorse basic labor rights for themselves, particularly those currently sought by FLOC and enjoyed by most other American workers. Though they experience substandard condtitions, almost all farmworkers actually hold much higher living and working standards for themselves and their families. This suggests that they are fully aware of the standard of living experienced by most other American workers. In addition, farmworkers feel some threat from agricultural mechanization for losing what little they do have. Such a discrepency between aspirations and realities is thought to be a major factor that motivates social movements and change. According to the 1982 public survey (Barger and Haas 1983), this same discrepency is held by the general population, and with both farmworkers and the public holding similar unachieved values it is possible that the general atmosphere is ripe for major socioeconomic changes in the agricultural system

in which farmworkers are invovled.

(4) The Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) and the United Farm Workers do indeed represent farmworkers, as they claim. Midwestern farmworkers largely endorse the farm labor movement in general and in the Midwest, including farm labor organizations, their goals, and their methods. Most farmworkers see FLOC and UFW as viable means for achieving their unfulfilled standards, and many are actively involved with these movement organizations. In fact, about the only reservation is that the movement takes years to achieve its goals, during which farmworkers have to support their families and are threatened with losing their primary means of subsistence through agriculutural mechanization. The 1982 public survey (Barger and Haas 1983) indicates that there is strong popular endorsement of the farmworker movement as well, and both the public and this survey jointly indicate that there is substantial internal and external potential for the success of the farmworker movement in the Midwest.

In summary, the current study is to our knowledge the only scientific, population-based investigations of the living and working conditions of Midwestern farmworkers and of the views and involvements of farmworkers themselves regarding the farmworker movement. This survey may be considered an initial study, and more research is needed with larger and more generalized samples which investigate cohort/longitudinal changes.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Barger, W. K., and Ain Haas
1983 Public Attitudes Toward Mexican American Farmworkers in the Midwest. La Red 63:2-4.

Barger, W. K., and Ernesto Reza
1984 Adaptation, Community Action, and the Farmworker Movement in the Midwest. In, Collaborative Research and Theories of Social Change. Jean Schensul, Gwen Stern, and Don Stull, eds. In press.

Chase, H. P., et al.
1971 Nutritional Status of Preschool Mexican American Migrant Farm Children 122:316-324.

Chavez, Cesar
1976 California Farm Workers' Struggle. The Black Scholar 7:16-19.

Coles, Robert
1970 Uprooted Children: The Early Life of Migrant Farm Workers. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Columbia Broadcasting System
1960 Harvest of Shame. Documentary.

Craddock, Brian R.
1979 Farmworker Protective Laws. Austin, Texas: Motivation Education and Training, Inc.

Day, Mark
1971 Forty Acres: Cesar Chavez and the Farm Workers. Praeger.

Denney, W. M.
1979 Participant Citizenship in a Marginal Group; Union Mobilization of California Farmworkers. American Journal of Political Science 23:330-337.

Dunbar, Anthony, and Linda Kravitz
1976 Hard Travelling: Migrant Farm Workers in America. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger.

Education Commission of the States
1979 Migrant Health. Denver: Interstate Migrant Education Task Force.

Estrada, Leobardo F.
1976 A Demographic Comparison of the Mexican Origin Population in the Midwest and Southwest, Atzlan 7:2:203-234.

Friedland, William
1969 Labor Waste in New York: Rural Exploitation and Migrant Workers. Transaction 6:48-53.

Friedland, William H., and Dorothy Nelkin
1971 Migrant. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
1972 Technological Trends and the Organization of Migrant Farm Workers: Social Problems 19:509-521.

Fuller, V., and B. Mason
1977 Farm Labor. Annals of the AAPS 77:63-80.

Galarza, Ernesto
1977 Farm Workers and Agri-Business in California, 1947-1960, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Gallasch, H. F.
1975 Minimum Wage and the Farm Labor Market. Southern Economic Journal 41:1:480-491.

Goldfarb, Ronald
1982 Migrant Farm Workers: A Caste of Despair. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University.

Good Neighbor Commission
1977 Texas Migrant Labor. Austin, Texas: Good Neighbor Commission of Texas.

Harper, David, Bobby Mills, and Ronald Farris
1974 Exploitation in Migrant Labor Camps. British Journal of Sociology 25:283-295.

Hightower, Tim
1978 Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times (2nd Ed.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman.

Hoffman, Cecil
1978 Empowerment Movements and Mental Health: Locus of Control and Commitment to the United Farm Workers. Journal of Community Psychology 6:3:216-221.

Indiana Advisory Committee
1974 Indiana Migrants. Chicago: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Jenkins, J. C., and C. Perrow
1977 Insurgency of the Powerless: Farmwork Movements (1946-1972). American Sociological Relview 42:249-268.

Johnson, Thomas M.
1976 Sociocultural Factors in the Intergroup Perception of Health Problems: A Case of Grower Attitudes Toward Their Migrant Labor. Human Organization 35:79-83.

Kushner, Sam
1975 Long Road to Delano. New York: International Publishers.

Larson, L. B., et al.
1974 Nutritional Status of Children of Mexican-American Migrant Families Journal of the American Diabetic Association 64:29-37.

London, Joan, and Henry Anderson
1970 So Shall Ye Reap. New YIork: Crowell.

Majka, Linda C.
1981 Labor Militancy Among Farm Workers and the Strategy of Protest: 1900-1979. Social Problems 28:50:533-547.

Martin, Philip
1977 Harvest Mechanization and Agricultural Trade Unionism: Obreros Unidos in Wisconsin. Labor Law Journal 28:3:166-173.

Moore, Truman E.
1965 The Slaves We Rent. New York: Random House.

National Broadcasting Company
1980 The Migrants. Documentary.

Reno, Lee P.
1970 Pieces and Scraps: Farm Labor Housing in the U.S. Washington, D.C.: Rural Housing Alliance.

Rochin, Refugio I.
1977 New Perspectives on Agricultural Labor Relations in California. Labor Law Journal 28:7:395-402.

Shiras, Peter
1979 Ohio Farmworkers Take on the Multinationals. WIN Magazine 15:31:1-3.

Smith, T. L.
1970 Farm Labor Trends in the U. S., 1910-1969. International Labor Review 102:August:149-169.

Solis, F.
1971 Socioeconomic and Cultural Conditions of Migrant Workers. Social Casework 52:308-315.

Sosnick, Stephen H.
1978 Hired Hands. Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin, West.

Sutton, Susan Buck, and Tracy Brunner
1983 Life on the Road: Midwestern Migrant Farmworker Survival Skills. Migration Today 11:1:25-31.

U. S. Congress-Senate Subcommittee on Labor
1952 Migratory Labor. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Federal Interagency Committee on Migrant Labor
1947 Migrant Labor. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Prisnting Office.

Walsh, Edward J.
1978 On the Interaction Between a Movement and Its Environment. American Sociological Review 43:110-112.

Young, Jan
1974 The Migrant Workers and Cesar Chavez. New York: Julian Messner.

Survey Results
March 7 1984

SURVEY OF MIDWESTERN FARMWORKERS (1983)

W. K. Barger and Ernesto Reza

Survey population:
Adult, male heads of household, Mexican American migrant farmworkers working tomato crops in the central Midwest (Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan), an estimated 3,000 people.

Number of interviews:

Indiana random sample (3.5% of the estimated state migrants)	28	(74%)
Ohio random sample (0.2% of the estimated state migrants)	3	(8%)
Michigan random sample (3.5% of the estimated state migrants)	7	(18%)
TOTAL (1.3% of the total estimated study population)	38	(100%)

Confidence interval at .10 level of significance: 0.13
There is a 90% probability that the response patterns reported here do not vary from those of the study population by more than 13% at the most (and by 0% at the least).

Language in which the interviews were conducted:

English	8%
Spanish	92%

I. FARMWORK EXPERIENCE

1. Average time worked in farm labor	18.9 years
2. Average generations worked in farm labor	2.1
3. How family got started in farmwork	
Other	28%
No other work available	38%
Not skilled/educated for other work	21%
Life change/crisis	14%
4.-6. Employment patterns	
AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT	9.0 months
AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT IN NONFARMWORK JOBS	1.7 months
AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT IN FARMWORK JOBS	7.3 months
AVERAGE ANNUAL TIME OF FARMWORK IN THE MIDWEST	3.4 months
7. Attitudes towards machines replacing farmworkers	
Negative	65%
Neutral	19%
Positive	16%
8. Have been displaced by agricultural mechanization	24%
9. What like the <u>most</u> about farmwork	
Nothing, do not like anything	11%
Other	5%
Provides a job/money	14%
Travel	11%
Doing physical work	11%
Working outside	14%
Set own work schedule/pace	16%
Working for self/family	8%
Family together	11%
10. What like the <u>least</u> about farmwork	
Other	8%
Physical problems	29%
Underemployment, not steady work, no work between crops	8%
Low pay	32%
Hard work	8%
Long hours	8%
No control over weather and other conditions	3%
Nothing, do not dislike anything	5%
11. How much like farmwork in general	
Not at all	3%
Not much	16%
Some	59%
Very much	22%

II. HEALTH CONDITIONS (SELF-REPORTED SYMPTOMS)

Average blood pressure	
Systolic+	134
Dyastolic+	79
Pulse rate+	71
HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE (greater than 160 SBP and/or 90 DBP)	10.5%
12. Self-reported general health condition	
Poor	16%
Fair	32%
Good	39%
Excellent	13%
13. Have current health problems that would like to see a doctor about	26%
14. Average months since last saw a doctor	26.3 months

In the past year or 12 months (Qs 15-50):

15. Have been in the hospital	5%
16. Had an accident or injury requiring medical treatment	16%
17. Deafness or ear trouble (other than temporary colds)	5%
18. Trouble seeing or eye problems (other than glasses)	13%
19. Ever lost any teeth	32%
20. Dental or gum problems	42%
21. Back injury	13%
22. Had neck/back pain for at least a month	32%
23. Had joints pain for at least a month	11%
24. Had a cold or flu	74%
25. Had persistent cough attacks	13%
26. Had increased cough and plegm for at least 3 weeks	13%
27. Had wheezing or whistling sounds in the chest	13%
28. Severe pain across the front of the chest for at least a half hour	5%
29. Had heart failure or "weak heart" with any severity	0%
30. Had infections of the kidneys or bladder	3%
31. Had loss of vision or blindness lasting from several minutes to several days	3%
32. Had difficulty in speaking or very slurred speech lasting from several minutes to several days	3%
33. Had prolonged weakness or paralysis lasting up to several months	0%
34. Had loss of sensation or numbness or tingling sensations lasting from several minutes to several days	13%
35. Had any reason to suspect may have diabetes	8%
36. Had a goiter or other thyroid trouble	3%
37. Had an illness which cut down the appetite	11%
38. Had difficulty swallowing for at least 3 days (other than sore throat from a cold)	5%
39. Had yellow jaundice, which made the skin or eyes turn yellow	0%
40. Had an abdominal operation	0%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF HEALTH PROBLEMS (scale = 0-26)	3.4
PROPORTION EXPERIENCING ABOVE AVERAGE HEALTH PROBLEMS	42%

\+ No data = 16%.

Average presentations for health care in the past year (Qs 41-47):	
41. Average presentations at a migrant or other public clinic	1.7
42. Average presentations at private doctor's office	0.6
43. Average presentations at a doctor's or group clinic	0.1
44. Average presentations at a company or industry clinic	0.0
45. Average presentations at a hospital outpatient clinic or emergency room	0.1
46. Average presentations to a curandero	0.2
47. Average times treated self by home treatment	1.6
AVERAGE ANNUAL PRESENTATIONS FOR HEALTH CARE	5.4
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE PRESENTATIONS	79%
48. Been told by a doctor or nurse in the past year that had a disease or health problem	24%
48a. Of those reporting YES, seriousness of health problem	
Seriously incapacitating or life threatening	0%
Somewhat incapacitating	78%
A mild health problem	22%
49. Other family members been told by a doctor or nurse in the past year that they had a disease or health problem	29%
49a. Of those reporting YES, average number of family members involved	1.1
49b. Seriousness of health problem of first person described	
Seriously incapacitating or life threatening	20%
Somewhat incapacitating	40%
A mild health problem	40%
50. Average number of times was sprayed by or otherwise exposed to pesticides (range from 0 to 40 times, with 21% reporting having been sprayed ten times or more)+	6.6
AVERAGE HEALTH STATUS (scale = 1-3)	2.0
AVERAGE OR BELOW HEALTH STATUS (estimated to be in need of immediate medical attention. Only one person in the sample revealed consistently healthy conditions)	97%

\+ No data = 11%.

III. GENERAL LIFE WELL-BEING

51. General feelings of being happy	84%
52. Feelings about things five years ago	
Happier	11%
About the same	74%
Not as happy	16%
53. Feelings about things five years from now	
Not as happy	22%
About the same	43%
Happier	35%
GENERAL FEELINGS OF OPTIMISM (scale = 0-3)	0%
54. Feelings of strain, stress, or pressure during the past month	45%
55. Feelings of tenseness (vs. relaxed) during the past month	54%
GENERAL FEELINGS OF TENSION (scale = 0-2)	57%

PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS

56. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me	16%
57. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor	5%
58. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with the help of my family or friends	8%
59. I (HAVE NOT) felt that I was as good as other people	53%
60. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing	16%
61. I felt depressed	16%
62. I felt that everything I did was an effort	5%
63. I (HAVE NOT) felt hopeful about the future	8%
64. I thought my life had been a failure	11%
65. I felt fearful	8%
66. My sleep was restless	22%
67. I was (NOT) happy	5%
68. I talked less than usual	11%
69. I felt lonely	8%
70. People were unfriendly	11%
71. I (HAVE NOT) enjoyed life	32%
72. I had crying spells	5%
73. I felt sad	16%
74. I felt that people disliked me	8%
75. I could not get "going"	16%
AVERAGE SYMPTOMS OF PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS (scale = 0-20)	2.9
PROPORTION EXPERIENCING ABOVE AVERAGE PSYCHOSOMATIC DISTRESS	25%

IV. LOCUS OF CONTROL

76. When you make plans ahead, do you usually get to carry out things as expected? or	63%
Do things usually come out to make you change your plans?	37%
77. Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way you want it to? or	55%
Have there been times when you haven't been sure about it?	45%
78. Some people feel they can run their lives pretty much they way they want to;	71%
Others feel the problems of life are sometimes too big for them. How about you?	29%
79. Do you think it's better to plan your life a good way ahead,	47%
Or, would you say life is too much a matter of luck to plan far ahead?	53%
Average internal locus of control (scale = 0-4)	2.4
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE INTERNAL LOCUS OF CONTROL	45%

INDIVIDUAL/GROUP IMPACT

80. The best way to improve farmworker conditions is	
For each individual to work hard and do the best he can for himself, or	38%
For people to work together for the good of the whole group.	62%

V. SOCIAL SUPPORTS

Feelings of emotional support	
81. Immediate family	92%
82. Other close relatives	74%
83. Compadres and padrinos	61%
84. Friends and relatives	42%
85. Fellow workers	32%
86. Bosses	16%
87. Labor unioin staff and officials	0%
88. Priests or clergymen	26%
89. Curanderos	0%
90. Medical professionals	5%
91. Social and other service workers	8%
Average feelings of emotional supports (scale = 0-11)	3.6
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE FEELINGS OF EMOTIONAL SUPPORTS	51%
Feelings of conceptual support+	
92. Immediate family	100%
93. Other close relatives	85%
94. Compadres and padrinos	62%
95. Friends and neighbors	32%
96. Fellow workers	21%
97. Bosses	18%
98. Labor union staff and officials	3%
99. Priests or clergymen	21%
100. Curanderos	3%
101. Medical professionals	6%
102. Social and other service workers	9%
Average feelings of conceptual suppports+	3.6
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE FEELINGS OF CONCEPTUAL SUPPORTS+	53%
Feelings of practical/material support+	
103. Immediate family	100%
104. Other close relatives	68%
105. Compadres and padrinos	65%
106. Friends and neighbors	41%
107. Fellow workers	21%
108. Bosses	9%
109. Labor union staff and officials	3%
110. Priests or clergymen	15%
111. Curanderos	0%
112. Medical professionals	3%
113. Social and other service workers	9%
Average feelings of practical supports (scale = 0-11)	3.5
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE FEELINGS OF PRACTICAL SUPPORTS+	41%
Average feelings of social supports (scale = 0-3)+	1.5
PROPORTION WITH ABOVE AVERAGE FEELINGS OF SOCIAL SUPPORTS+	50%

\+ No data = 11%.

VI. EXPERIENCE IN MIDWEST

Reported degree of some social interaction	
114. Other farmworkers	89%
115. Crew leaders	71%
116. Farmers	32%
117. Local merchants and store clerks	26%
118. Social service agencies	16%
119. Local Latino residents	29%
120. Local Anglo residents	13%
AVERAGE NUMBER OF SOCIAL RELATIONS WHILE IN THE MIDWEST	2.8
PROPORTION EXPERIENCING SOCIETAL ISOLATION WHILE IN THE MIDWEST (Includes only one or no interaction with people outside the camp/field work setting.)	66%
Reported social experience while in the Midwest	
121. Good experiences with Midwestern Anglos	92%
122. Good experiences with Midwestern growers	92%
123. Good experiences with crew leaders while in the Midwest	87%
POSITIVE SOCIAL EXPERIENCES WHILE IN THE MIDWEST	92%

VII. ATTITUDES TOWARD LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS

Perceived problems of farmworkers in comparison with Midwesterners	
124. Poorer housing and sanitation facitlities	92%
125. More diseases and other health problems	84%
126. Poorer education	74%
127. Greater discrimination and prejudice	61%
128. More child labor	76%
129. Greater exposure to pesticides and hazardous chemicals	79%
129a. Have ever been promised a job only to find there was none when arrived in the Midwest+	25%
FARMWORKERS EXPERIENCING SEVERELY DEPRIVED CONDITIONS (Includes perceived greater problems, low family income [less than $10,000], and un/underemployment [less than 8 months]. The other 5% also experience deprived conditions, but less severe.))	95%

\+ No data = 37%.

VIII. VIEWS ON FARMWORKER LABOR RIGHTS

130.	Believe farmworkers should have access to fresh drinking water while working in the fields	100%
131.	Believe farmworkers should have access to restroom and hand washing facilities while working in the fields	100%
132.	Believe farmworkers should receive earnings that average at least the minimum wage for time working in the fields	100%
133.	Believe farmworkers should receive payment for travel expenses in coming to work crops in this area	100%
134.	Believe farmworkers should receive full wages each payday, rather than having part withheld for an end-of-the-season "bonus"	97%
135.	Believe farmworkers should receive workman's compensation for work-related injuries and disabilities	97%
136.	Believe farmworkers should receive health insurance as a part of their working conditions	100%
137.	Believe farmworkers should receive unemployment insurance benefits as a part of their working conditions	100%
138.	Believe farmworkers should receive first choice of new jobs created when agricultural mechanization eliminates old jobs	100%
139.	Believe farmworkers should receive retraining programs when displaced by agricultural mechanization	100%
AVERAGE ENDORSEMENT OF LABOR RIGHTS (Includes positive attitudes toward labor rights.)		99%

IX. VIEWS ABOUT THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT

140. Have heard of the United Farm Workers (UFW)	61%
140a. For those who have heard, how they learned about UFW	
Media	18%
Other farmworkers	9%
Relatives or friends	5%
Union organizers	68%
140b. For those who have heard, what they understand about UFW	
Does not understand the purpose well	4%
Works for better rights and conditions	18%
Works for better rights and conditions through labor organizing and collective bargaining	78%
141. Have heard of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC)	53%
141a. For those who have heard, how they learned about FLOC	
Media	6%
Other farmworkers	44%
Relatives or friends	13%
Union organizers	38%
141b. For those who have heard, what they understand about FLOC	
Does not understand the purpose well	11%
Works for better rights and conditions	17%
Works for better rights and conditions through labor organizing and collective bargaining	72%
142. What like the <u>most</u> about these kind of organizations+	
Nothing, do not like anything	3%
Other	28%
Works for better conditions and rights	66%
Unity of farmworkers	3%
143. What like the <u>least</u> about these kind of organizations+	
Other	14%
Takes too long to accomplish results	24%
Nothing, do not dislike anything	62%
144. General attitude toward how much organizations like UFW and FLOC are good for farmworkers*	
Disapproves	9%
Approves	91%

\+ No data = 24%.
* No data = 13%.

145.	Think farmworkers should have the right to labor organizing and collective bargaining	97%
146.	Think farmworker organizations like UFW and FLOC should negotiate contracts with those growers and agricultural businesses whose products involve farmworkers' labor+	91%
147.	Would prefer working at a job under contract to a farmworker organization rather than working under the personal arrangements of a crew leader.	92%
148.	If necessary, think farmworkers should go on strike to achieve better working rights and conditions	84%
149.	Aware of the FLOC strike against Campbell Soup and Libby tomatoes in this region	46%
150.	Aware of the UFW grape and lettace boycotts a few years ago	61%
150a.	For those who were aware, participated in these boycotts (28% of the total sample)	52%
151.	Aware of the current FLOC boycott of Campbell Soup products	32%
151a.	For those who were aware, participated in this boycott (32% of the total sample)	92%
152.	Approve of these kinds of public boycotts to help achieve better working rights and conditions for farmworkers+	85%
153.	Believe that these kinds of public boycotts help achieve better working rights and conditions for farmworkers++	78%
154.	Currently belong to a farm labor organization	22%
	NOTE: 11% more indicated that they used to belong to the UFW, but had let their membership lapse.	
154a.	For those <u>not</u> belonging, would be interested in belonging to a farm labor organization like UFW or FLOC (43% of the total sample)*	55%
154b.	For those who <u>do</u> belong, membership	
	UFW	50%
	Both the UFW and FLOC	50%
155.	Main reason joined or would join a farm labor organization	
	Not interested in joining	17%
	Other	14%
	To get better conditions for self/family	46%
	To get better conditions for farmworkers in general	9%
	To work together with other farmworkers for better conditions	14%

\+ No data = 11%.
++ No data = 16%.
* A total of 65% therefore report either belonging to a farm labor organization or interest in belonging.

FOR THOSE WHO ARE MEMBERS OF A FARM LABOR ORGANIZATION

156a. How came to join

Convinced by relatives/friends	14%
Convinced by union organizers	86%

156b. How being a member has changed life

Not much	43%
Personal development	43%
Social development	14%

156c. Ways are involved in the organization

Regular contact and information	71%
Participates in events and activities	14%
Is involved in strikes, organizing, and other operations	14%

156d. Degree of involvement in the organization

Not much	71%
A lot	29%

KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT 45%
(Includes knowledge claimed about a majority of the following items: UFW and FLOC, the Campbell Soup strike, and the UFW and FLOC boycotts.)

POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT 79%
(Includes expressed positive attitudes toward a majority of the following items: farmworker organizations, collective bargaining, labor negotiations, contracts, and strikes, approval and effectiveness of boycotts, and a rating by the interviewer.)

ACTIVE SUPPORT OF THE FARM LABOR MOVEMENT 32%
(Includes a majority of the following items: participation in the UFW and FLOC boycotts, membership in a farmworker organiztion, and a rating by the interviewer on the degree of committment to the farmworker movement.)

VIII. DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

157. Home base	
Midwest	3%
Florida	34%
Texas	63%
158. Place of birth	
Mexico	19%
Florida	22%
Texas	59%
159. Average age	36.2 years
160. Males*	100%
161. Mexican/Mexican-American ethnic heritage*	100%
162. Married marital status*	100%
163. Average family size	5.6 people
163a. Number of workers in the family+	3.6 people
163b. Number of adult (18+) workers in the family+	2.6 people
AVERAGE CHILD LABOR PER FAMILY	1.0 children
ESTIMATED CHILDREN INVOLVED IN TOMATO CROPS IN CENTRAL MIDWEST	3,000
164. Average educational level completed	6.8 grade
165. Some ability to speak English	71%
166. Some ability to read English	61%
BASIC ABILITY TO COMMUNICATE IN ENGLISH	58%
167. Farmworker occupation*	100%
168. Average total 1982 household income before taxes	$6,447
169. Average total household earnings while in the Midwest (53% of annual income)	$3,395
170. Average total household spending while in the Midwest (25% of annual income, 49% of Midwestern earnings)	$1,650
TOTAL ESTIMATED SPENDING OF TOMATO WORKERS WHILE IN THE CENTRAL MIDWEST	$5 million

\+ No data = 29%.

* The study population was defined as adult, male heads of household, Mexican-American migrant farmworkers involved with the tomato crops in the Central Midwest.

171. Church or religious affiliation	
"Evengelical" Protestant	3%
"Mainstream" Protestant	0%
Romen Catholic	97%
172. Degree of participation in religious activities	
Not at all	5%
Once a year or so	11%
Once every few months	26%
Once every few weeks	42%
At least once a week	16%
173. Reported degree of religiousness	
Not at all religious	3%
Not very religious	22%
Somewhat religious	68%
Very religious	8%
174. Membership in labor unions	
None	79%
Industrial or trade union	0%
Farm labor union	21%
175. Citizenship	
Mexico	11%
U.S.	89%
176. Voted in last national elections	13%
177. Political party preference	
None	58%
Republican	0%
Other	3%
Democrat	39%
177a. Registered voter+	13%
Average number of housing units in labor camp	17
Average length of interviews	77 min.

+ No data = 58%.